DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 328 SP 009 563

AUTHOR	Bender, Albert E.
TITLE	Centers for Teachers: England and the U. S. A.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Salem.
PUB DATE	Sep 75
NOTE	19p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Oregon ASCD Curriculum Bulletin, P. O. Box 421, Salem, Oregon 97308 ($1.50)
JOURNAL CIT	Oregon ASCD Curriculum Bulletin; v29 n328 p1-17 Sep 1975
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; *Comparative Education; Foreign Countries; Inservice Teacher Education; Program Descriptions; *Resource Centers; *Teacher Centers
IDENTIFIERS	England; Wales

ABSTRACT

Teachers' centers were developed in England and Wales, and although American educators have been quick to adopt words such as teacher center and resource center, they do not understand the basic of teachers' centers. In England and Wales, the centers are established in response to very subjective local teacher needs. Teachers' centers for primary teachers are the most common type, and they all serve both the social and professional needs of teachers. There are also technical and science centers for teachers, operated by specialists who are not teachers. Resource centers are like teachers' centers, except that the major emphasis is on the professional side as opposed to the social side of the teachers' lives. Miscellaneous centers include materials centers and centers which are very narrow in their interest and tend to be operated by one person. Establishment of professional centers has also been proposed. These centers would be similar to teachers' centers, but would be responsible for the supervision of the probationary teacher. In America, the teachers' centers are for the teachers but are not under teacher control. Teachers may recommend, but they do not control the financial aspects, hire the center leader, or decide what materials and equipment are to be secured or who can use the center. If a free society is evolving, then American schools need the type of educational changes presently underway in England and Wales. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED113328

Oregon ASCD

Curriculum Bulletin

Centers for Teachers: England and the U.S.A.

Prepared by:
Dr. Albert E. Bender
Department of Education
Saint Louis University
Saint Louis, Missouri

No. 328
XXIX
September 1975
Price $1.50

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP009 563

Published by:

Oregon Association for Superivision and Curriculum Development
P.O. Box 421
Salem, Oregon 97308

Editor:
Charles Gengler

Associate Editors:
Jule Crume
Rose Marie Service
Harold Stauffer

Editor Emeritus
Hugh B. Wood

Centers for Teachers: England and the U.S.A.

by
Albert E. Bender

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Centers for Teachers	1
Teachers' Centers	3
Science and Technology Centers	5
Resource Centers	5
Miscellaneous Centers	6
Purposes and Problems of Teachers' Centers	6
Change and New Knowledge	7
Freedom and Responsibility	8
Teachers' Centers	9
Central Purpose	9
Professional Center	11
The American Response	12
Footnotes	14

Teachers' centers were developed in England and Wales. No two are alike, yet each has something in common with all other centers. A teachers' center is a place for teachers to meet professionally and socially. It is usually away from school, has a leader, often called a warden, has a work area and places to sit, work, read, and talk, provisions for coffee and tea, is run for and by teachers with the cooperation of others, and is probably supported by the Local Education Authority (LEA).

Educators in the U.S.A. have been quick to adopt words such as teacher center, center for teachers, resource center, et cetera; but they have not been so quick to adopt the ideas of a teachers' center. The words are popular, but the basic ideas of teachers' centers are either not understood by American educators or they are not appreciated by them.

This study of teachers' centers deals with the reality in England and Wales, and with expressions of that reality in the U.S.A. Thus, that which follows is mostly about what is in England and Wales, what is being promoted in the U.S.A., and what is different between these two areas which inhibits blanket adoption of the British style teachers' center in America.

CENTERS FOR TEACHERS

Successful and publicized centers in America are of several general types: material resource centers, specially operated for teachers by media or audio / visual staff; special education / handicapped centers, also operated for teachers; and workshops, off campus courses, and institutes, which are operated for teachers by university faculty, school administrators, and citizen groups anxious to use government monies to save our schools. None of the above is a teachers' center since they are all meeting the needs of teachers and schools as seen by some non-teacher group.[1]

Centers for teachers in England and Wales fall, more or less, into categories of teachers' centers, technical and science centers, area resource centers, and miscellaneous centers. Teachers' centers are the greatest in number and in differences. They are run by teachers for teachers usually from an immediate geographic and educational area, more often they involve primary teachers than secondary teachers, they are involved with curriculum change and / or with curriculum development, and they tend to meet both professional and social needs of teachers.

Technical and science centers are for teachers but are usually operated by specialists from industry or persons from further (higher) education or research institutions in cooperation with teachers. Technical centers tend to deal with the application of science, while science centers are more involved with pure science. Resource centers are like teachers' centers, but with major emphasis on the professional and little concern for the social side of the teachers' lives. They usually serve larger geographic and academic areas. Miscellaneous centers include both materials centers and centers which are very narrow in their interest and tend to be operated by one person.

General as the above definitions are, it is difficult to find an English or Welsh center which fits totally into one of those descriptions. This is understandable since centers are not established according to some objective criteria, but are in response to very subjective local teacher needs. Some centers are so subjective that they never have communicated with other centers, while most are so new that a final structure is yet to evolve.

At the time of the James Committee report, A. Stevens pointed out that in 1960 there was one center, a Teachers' Club. In 1969 there were 270 centers and 1971 there were 520 centers.[2] The National Union of Teachers (NUT) in a 1971 publication reported on information gained from 167 of the 476 extant centers.[3] In May 1972 the Schools Council (national government) mimeographed a list of centers, 91 pages averaging 10 centers per page.[4] The University of London Institute of Education in October

1971 also produced a lenthy list of centers in the greater London area which were sponsored by Education Authorities school districts),[5] while a March 1974 article states that there are over 600 centers.[6]

There is no agreement among the various tabulating groups as to the exact number of centers, first because it is difficult to determine if, in fact, an establishment is a center, and second because many centers have no reason to report their existence to tabulating groups.

As centers take on more and more areas of concern, they become more organized. Emmeline Garnett maintains that the larger and better organized a center becomes, the further away it goes from the individual teacher. It would seem that the Area Resource Center, especially, has built into itself its own destruction.[7] It will be interesting to see how the highly organized Texas resource center system deals with this problem.

The 1968 Schools Council study of 308 centers reports that centers usually serve teachers from several schools. One reported serving twenty schools, while, at the other extreme, another served fifty secondary and 120 primary schools. In similar breadth, one served twenty-two teachers, another served 8,000 teachers.[8]

The physical differences among centers ranged from one room centers, sometimes shared with someone else, to one center which spent 75,000 dollars to adapt a facility for its use.[9]

The desire for teachers to have their centers away from schools is obvious from the data. According to the NUT data about three-fourths of the centers had separate buildings and the same number were specially adapted.[10]

Over a third of the centers in the Schools Council 1968 study reported being located within a school building, but having their own room. Over half had their own unshared facility, about ten percent shared facilities with another group, while five centers were "purpose-built."[11]

For several possible reasons, such as less money, fewer problems, greater distance between schools, and / or provincialism, rural centers do not have the advantages of urban centers. The former averaged three rooms per center, while the latter averaged seven rooms. Considering the large number of centers in greater London along with the skyrocketing cost of housing there, the difference is even more striking. As will be seen later, the rural centers are also disadvantaged in monetary expenditures.[12]

Most centers are controlled by teachers. The 1968 Schools Council study claims that for every five teacher controlled centers there are two Local Education Authority (LEA) controlled centers.[13] A 1972 article points out that a LEA can control a teachers' center, but that the NUT has fought against this and that most teachers' centers remain teacher controlled.[14]

Most of these 308 centers were established by primary teachers. Eighty-nine of them were the result of the Nuffield or Schools Council maths (mathematics), science, and / or modern language programs.[15] Half the centers, responding in the NUT report, operated full time, and half were governed by a constitution.

The establishment of the position of warden, director, or leader, has been as natural as the growth of centers – the center being in response to local teacher need, and the warden in response to center need. By 1971 the NUT was reported to be studying the working conditions of wardens, who had already begun to organize in some parts of England and Wales.[16]

The NUT found that the salary of the warden was usually based upon the salary for teachers (Burnham) and, more often than not, it was found to be above scale.[17] It should be safe to conclude from this that early in the growth of centers the position of warden was seen to be important. According to the NUT study ninety-four percent of the wardens were appointed by the LEAs and seventy-eight percent of these had permanent appointments.[18] The report was not clear as to whether a committee of teachers at a teacher controlled center did not, in fact, recommend a person for the position of warden, with the LEA making the appointment, since it paid the salary. Because of the nature of centers it would not be unfair to conclude that this was the normal practice.

The Schools Council study reported that the usual need of a center was for a full time warden, who was the right person, and that clerical assistance was also essential for a successful center.[19] Of the 164 centers having a leader at the time of that study, 101 were full time and sixty-three were part time.[20]

The problems faced by wardens were in trying to avoid becoming housekeepers and paper summarizers. Without clear understanding of their duties, it was natural for the wardens to end up doing the dishes in the center and preparing summaries of Schools Council papers. They might also end up as administrators of centers, which was considered to be only slightly less offensive than the above.

The purpose of wardens, if it is not to be the above, can be seen by the skills needed for the position. They had to be able to lead discussions, know behavioral psychology, have knowledge of curriculum planning, of sociology, and of resources and information for teachers. They are, in fact, group leaders, and not the servants or administrators for groups.[21]

The NUT study reported that two-thirds of the centers had additional staff beyond the warden, almost all of these being part time employees. These included secretaries, technicians, domestics, and even some gardners, cooks, waitresses, and barmen. Twenty-seven

of the larger centers had caretakers, eighteen of whom were full time employees.[22]

Money wise, the rural centers spent less than half the amount on display equipment than did urban centers. The average amount of money spent by rural centers for reproduction equipment was 415 dollars, while urban centers averaged 1,250 dollars. The annual budget for rural centers averaged 1,600 dollars, and for urban centers it was 9,000 dollars, with two centers having budgets in excess of 50,000 dollars.[23]

As would be expected with something which grew without establishment support, much of the cost for a center is hidden, yet the NUT reported that ninety-four percent of the centers did not charge teachers for courses and that two-thirds of the centers granted some type of travel allowance to the participants of center courses.[24]

Aline Sandilands, in a 1971 article in a NUT journal, estimates that about one-third of all teachers work with a center.[25]

Teachers' Centers

The Schools Council study of Teachers' Centers points out that the center idea clearly came into existence following the passage of the 1944 Education Act, but that many things, which are being done at centers, have been done since the 1920s.

Most centers have little problem with the social part of a center. Rarely are students present since teachers want to get off by themselves. However, the professional purpose of most centers remains in flux. Should the limited resources be used for curriculum development, involving a small hard core of teachers, or should the center zero in on the retraining of teachers, benefiting many more teachers? If curriculum development is a center effort, the creative teacher has the pretige of the center for support and protection. The report of the Schools Council points out that in practice a balance between these two groups was next to impossible. In fact, the two groups were divided, not only academically, but emotionally.[26]

Teachers' centers for primary teachers are, by far, the most common type. They serve both social and professional needs of teachers. An example would be the center at Shropshire, which began in late 1962, where teachers met to attend lectures and discuss them, to view films, to form special interest groups such as poetry groups, etc. These groups set up their own programs because the college of education courses were not coordinated. In the process the teachers got to know others with similar problems and, by exchanging knowledge, experience, and ideas, were able to move toward solutions to teaching problems without each making the same mistake.[27]

It was found that an essential first step, as centers grew in service to themselves, was to provide courses such as national projects, which met the needs of many teachers. These courses usually developed into local study and / or project groups. Ideally, the goals of center groups were clear and short ranged, since, where this was absent, much time was wasted and many teachers lost interest.[28]

Contrary to this is a 1969 article in the **Times Educational Supplement**, which reported that one center had been so structured that it would assist the teacher in developing, expanding, and clarifying the teacher's idea. The center did not see its role as helping teachers become expert with equipment, but would provide technicians to assist the teachers with equipment use in order to finalize their project.[29]

In spite of such reports, the major purpose of primary centers was as a place for teachers to hold workshops and have facilities for work, while the secondary teachers more often needed someone, usually provided by the school system, to lead the other teachers in some academic area.[30]

A detailed study of two primary centers involving a total of 272 teachers concludes that, although more women than men used the center, a higher percentage of men (significant at the .01 level) attended, and a higher percentage of experienced teachers (significant at the .01 level) attended more regularly.[31]

Several centers began as a direct result of the Nuffield Maths project (Nuffield Foundation). One was the Nuffield Centre, where teachers were assisted in workshops with the new mathematics. They usually met during the school day by common agreement of teacher and administrators. The workshops were not preplanned in this fashion, but grew naturally in this direction, a fact typical of centers in general. Although a math center, Nuffield saw itself as part of the answer to the broader problems of teaching, communication, and teacher responsibility.[32] Gradually the center became involved with inservice programs at all levels and included further (higher) education schools as part of its group.[33]

The Yeovil Centre, also involved with Nuffield mathematics, became a multi-purpose operation. Interestingly, the warden of this famous center, who had both primary and secondary teaching experience, saw as part of his responsibility, the need to bring out teacher insecurity so they would seek help.[34]

In one twelve month period the center offered twenty-one courses, a third of which were away from the center, one-fourth during the school day, the rest were held after school including one Saturday course. A questionnaire showed that twenty-two percent of the teachers wanted courses during the school day, and twenty-three point eight percent were so scheduled. Half of these courses were taught by teachers, while the other half were taught by advisers or visiting lecturers. At-

tendance ranged from ten to sixty-eight teachers with the average being twenty-eight. Courses ran for from one to eight sessions with the average having four sessions and only one having one session.[35]

At another center one-fourth of the nineteen courses were taught away from the center. One was taught during the the school day, and one was held on Saturday. Seventeen were taught after school and most of these were evening courses. Ten of the courses were held for one session, one had twenty-four sessions, and the rest ran between two to six sessions. Eleven of the courses were taught by visiting lecturers or advisers, and eight by teachers.[36]

The SC 1968 study of centers, in defining a center, pointed out the need for the center either to have its own accomodation, or in some way to be isolated from the school, since without this isolation a center could not be independent. This, along with teacher control, was found to reduce the teachers' fear of control by people from further (higher) education. Insistance upon separate facilities should not result in the conclusion that a center is a building. It is people![37]

There has been a strong relationship between the success of a center and interest of the schools heads (principals).[38] The significance of this point falls short for Americans if they do not realize that the head of a school in the United Kingdom has been in almost total control of the school and has been protected by a tenure unknown in many American systems. The head, more than the LEA, sets the policy of the school. In the past, Her Majesty's Inspectors carried considerable weight, but lately they have been advisory. It has been the heads who released teachers for center work and who permitted and encouraged the use of centers.

The primary school heads were often directly involved with centers; while, because of the size of secondary schools, especially since the movement toward consolidated schools as a government policy and the resultant closing of many traditional grammar (academic high) schools, along with the more traditional academic structuring of secondary faculty, the chairmen of departments are usually more directly involved with centers.[39]

Communication was a major problem for centers. This was best accomplished by personal contact, both by users of the center and by wardens visiting the schools served by the center. Written communication was also used. Eventually a group of teachers from a school, who were identified with the center projects, handled center promotion at that school in proportion to their success as teachers.[40]

Most of the older centers (1968 SC report) were found to be under teacher control, with the LEAs tactfully advising. When the LEA provided money, it was found to be of considerable advantage to have an official of the LEA assist in advising the center. The success of teacher control was possible because of the number of teachers who had prior successful committee experience, and, it resulted in teachers knowing that the center was truly theirs.[41]

Either a committee of teachers or a warden have been required for the day operation of a center. A larger committee, which would accept greater responsibility, functioned better with the addition of a representative of the LEA. Meanwhile, most centers usually had a large meeting about once each semester for all interested teachers, and the smaller committee was usually representative of this group.[42]

A 1971 article reported that most centers continued to be run by teachers. By then it was found that while a committee of older teachers was better able to secure assistance from the LEA, a committee controlled by younger faculty members was better able to establish communication among teachers.[43]

David Johnston, former Adviser to Teachers at the University of London Institute of Education, presents necessities for a teacher center. They include a place for pre-and practicing teachers to meet in comfort; a library for teachers; language lab for those language teachers who know grammar, but need to work on oral language; a place to try things and an experimental materials center; a display area; an information and communications center; reproduction equipment; experimental equipment; research aids; and, finally, the center must be convenient, comfortable, attractive, and social.[444] At least implied in the last suggestion, is the need for kitchen equipment, for certainly two Englishmen never met socially without having sweets and tea. (It seemed to me that the English always drink tea, if coffee isn't served). A detailed report of two centers corroborate Johnston's list.

The Hampshire Centre has been housed in the former Borough Education office. There is parking for thirty-six automobiles. On the ground floor of the building there is a carpeted area with very comfortable chairs, a small kitchen, and a conference room for sixty people. The second floor (their first floor) houses the library, the Organizer's (warden) office, a smaller discussion room, a reading library, and an exhibition room. The third floor (their second) contains the educational media equipment (they continue to use the term audio / visual to describe the latest equipment), and a storeroom. This floor contains office machines and teaching machines including typewriters, copiers, microscopes, cameras, records, et cetera.[45]

Another primary center has been located in a former hostel. There is parking for thirty-two cars, and it contains many small rooms and bathrooms because of its former use. It is carpeted.[46]

Most of the 308 (SC 1968) reporting centers had

lounges, workshop areas, and a tea-making area. More specifically, thirty-eight of the centers had a science laboratory, nineteen had an A / V room (half of these being in London), seventy-one had kitchens, and fifty-seven had offices.[47]

Science and Technology Centers

Both science and technology centers differ from teacher centers in that the major effort to establish such centers often comes from nonteachers, e.g. other educators, scientists, or technicians. Most of these centers would exist under another name had not the term center become so acceptable among teachers. They are, as often as not, workshops.

One such center has been operated by a group of educators, scientists, and technicians who run workshops (under Nuffield) to train and retrain teachers in the use of scientific equipment. Some of these have been one week workshops, others have met weekly for a semester. The growing interest was obvious from the increased enrollment to the point of needing more room.[48]

Scientific centers generally deal with advanced secondary subjects, have been organized by members of professional societies, and use university facilities. As of 1970, there were fifteen physics, twenty chemistry, and nine biology centers in England and Wales.[49] The cost of these centers has been hidden since they used free university facilities and the staff and faculty often volunteered their services. The emphasis in science centers had been on pure science.[50]

The technology centers differ from the science centers in that there has been no set form for the establishment of technology centers. They have involved the education establishment at all levels along with industry and tended to develop through the contact of individual teachers with university, college, and / or industrial persons.[51]

Of the seven centers extant in 1970 and the eight planned, no two were alike. The advantage of working more closely with industry is being realized, therefore growth in this area of centers seems most promising.[52] As opposed to the science centers, the technology centers emphasize the practical use of science.[53]

Meanwhile, many teacher's centers have workshops dealing with the same matter as the science and technology centers.[54] The advantage of the latter is that these centers can operate where adequate equipment is available.

Presently, the most pressing problem reported by science and technology centers is for a paid liaison officer who could promote the center in a local area. Just who would pay this person would have to be resolved in each case by itself.[55]

The national study discourages any national organization of these types of centers, since the heart of these, and other centers, is local need. But the report encourages the continuation of studies of these centers and the establishment of communication among them along with meetings of the various individuals involved with science and technology courses.[56]

Resource Centers

The Schools Council report on area Resource Centers distinguishes between these centers and Resource Collections and Resource Libraries, a distinction not always made in America. The former of the latter two is a collection of any materials collected within a school, while the last is an index of items available, much as the library indexes books. A Resource Center encourages the production and utilization of a resource collection, including local teacher and group production, the listing of other available materials, the acquisition of materials as to their present usefullness.[57]

The area resources center needs sufficient staff to enable individual schools in an area to share materials and abilities. This improves the quality of work done while relieving the need for each school to provide this service. The next problem is to make sharing possible so all teachers can be acquainted with the new approach. If only a small group within the area use the materials and services, the schools can never enjoy total change.[58]

The professional nature of area resource centers is reported by Garnett, who suggests that as schools produce more and more of their own materials there is a need for professional manufacturing, a clearing house for such materials, such as tape clubs, a training center for production, and retrieval and loan centers.[59] The resource center should acquire or report how teachers can secure the widest possible materials and how they can be most effectively used, not for the purpose of making teaching better, but to make learning more effective.[60]

There is agreement that area resource centers should do only projects which teachers' centers cannot do. Additionally, it is agreed that the same people should not control both teachers' centers and resource centers in a given area, but they should work closely together. In fact, in working with teachers' centers, the area resource centers have an excellent means of keeping the lines of communication open with teachers.[61]

Resource centers are needed because of the emphasis upon individualized over class textbook buying. Presently, sets of different books are purchased which cover a subject area, while in the past, a set of school classbooks were all the same. In addition to book purchases, resource centers acquire A / V materials and projects related to the subject, which are often locally produced to meet local need. The resource center also provides a materials preparation area for teachers.[62]

As can be seen from this, the area resource centers

lack the basic social attitude of teacher centers. Perhaps the resource center can be described as meeting the learning needs of students by providing very professional services for teachers, while the teachers' center faces the needs of teachers in a much more personal way. Since both centers provide similar needs for teachers, who differ greatly one from another, and both are enjoying growth, they cannot be seen as other than different from each other.

An Area Resource Center has five basic components: the factory, storage and retrieval, a clearing house, a training center, and speciality workshops.[63]

The factory assists teachers or teacher groups in preparing materials, with the assistance of center staff, which are of the quality of published materials but have greater local meaning.[64]

The storage and retrieval has several built in problems. It requires too much space and takes too many staff members for a center to store all usable materials within a center. The solution is simply to have a catalog stating what material is available, where it is, and how to get it. Much of this material can be stored by having it displayed at schools.[65]

The problem of indexing is two-fold. Card indexing is locally the most possible, but it immediately limits the amount of material which can be indexed. A national system would be ideal, but it is impossible because of the cost. The money which could be used for this could be better spent for other more important projects. Thus, the national system is impossible because of the present shortages of personnel and money available for education.[66]

There are several needs to be met by a clearing house. It shares successful projects, tells how a teacher did what and how others can do it. It provides for the sharing of tapes, such as BBC programs, each school reporting which it has available. The clearing house also reports who is working on what type of project so work on, or interest in, a project can be shared.[67]

The training center within an area resource center enables teachers to understand and use the new materials in proper fashion. The staff of the center works with school faculty at the school, both in preparing materials and in learning to use them. The benefit to the center is in the addition of much free help who would not be available at the center, namely, the school faculty. In the spirit of new education, lecturers are not permitted in training sessions.[68]

Since the responsibility of the area resource center is to assist in the professional growth of teachers, they do not strive for overly professional staff. This obligation for professional ability for teachers is often accomplished by teachers working at the center, usually through secondments (a teacher being released from teaching duties, whose duties are then taken by a supply teacher).[69] Most schools have an extra teacher or more on the staff for this and other purposes. One article, which shall go unfootnoted, by an educator from England visiting one of our larger cities, told how an American city had one substitute teacher for every four regular teachers, and he stated the need for such a ratio in England and Wales. Needless to say, their supply teachers are not the same as our substitute teachers.

Although area resource centers should not do projects which can be done by teacher centers, they should keep sufficiently informed to prevent several teacher centers from doing the same project. Further, when passing on ideas or suggestions, the area resource center staff should be most careful not to come on too strongly, but hold back, pulling out the ideas from the teachers. And the center should work closely with the Teacher Training Institutes, using their staffs, equipment, et cetera.[70]

Specialty workshops were held through area resource centers and dealt primarily with the use of equipment, such as a radio center, which is both complicated and expensive.[71]

Miscellaneous Centers

There are some centers in England and Wales which are solely involved with BBC materials. These materials are expensive and few teachers' centers can afford many of them. Not only do these centers share the BBC materials much as an Area Resource Center, but also they screen films and hold discussions among teachers as to their proper use. As with other specialized centers, this activity can take place in other type centers.

Another type center is set up by one person, in cooperation with others, which brings a person's special collection or ability to teachers, students, and others interested in the material or project. In one such center the leader excelled in story telling, and helped others develop this skill along with materials to enhance story telling.[72]

PURPOSES AND PROBLEMS OF TEACHERS' CENTERS

No matter what type of English or Welsh center is considered, each is the result of a greater sharing of the reponsibility in establishing more meaningful educational institutions and practices, especially on the part of teachers in relation to their students. The presence of a new direction in educational philosophy and the recognition by teachers of this new direction is, indeed, most encouraging. Perhaps this acceptance of individual responsibility by teachers is the most effective step in the development of like attitudes among students. The same must be said for teacher acceptance of change.

Yet the teachers' centers should not be seen as the new truth, nor should one presume that centers are

accepted by all teachers or every school in England and Wales. Teachers' centers are involved with evolution, not revolution. They are as much the result of respect for teachers as they are the result of teachers' accepting responsibility.

As stated, teachers' centers have three basic purposes. They provide for inservice programs, they are a social center for teachers, and they are places for curriculum development by teachers. One of the problems faced by centers is the conflict which often exists between the inservice purpose of a center and its use as a center for curriculum development. But first, the social aspect of centers is to be considered, since this may be a **non sequitur** for American centers.

In England and Wales, much more than in the United States, people actively belong to clubs. They provide a place for meeting socially rather than in the home. Prior to World War II Americans were more inclined to meet at the club, be it a golf or tennis club, a veteran or fraternal organization, a secret society such as the Masons or Knights of Columbus, or the local bar. More often than not these social meeting places were not built out of job associations, so that members of a work group did not tend to meet at one usual place.

The establishment and growth of places for teachers with common interests and concerns to meet was socially acceptable in England and Wales, but for Americans this side of center activity seems to be neither needed nor desired. In fact the development of this part of center activity might drive many American educators away from centers.

The professional purpose of a center has greater purpose for Americans, both for curriculum development and for inservice education and educational materials preparation.

In a statement dealing with the problems of teachers' centers related to inservice and curriculum development, the protagonists were able to agree upon the ideas behind these two purposes of teachers' centers.

> For a given area of learning, curriculum development was the process of defining the aims and the objectives of their teaching, the construction of methods and materials to achieve the objectives, an assessment of their effectiveness, and finally a feedback of these results to form a new starting-point for further study. Inservice training was essentially the imparting of the results of successful curriculum development and the reinforcement of that success. That relationship had always existed, even if it had not been recognized so explicitly. Perhaps it was the scale of the involvement of teachers working in a co-operative fashion that made it necessary to spell out the relationship more clearly.[74]

The problem of the purpose of a center becomes very pressing when it is realized that the resources for centers are limited. In fact, the centers were, in part, born out of economic poverty which made direction from the national government impossible. This was not a misfortune. The age of the obedience and paternalism was given way to the age of the individual responsibility; and, the changeless past was being replaced by the ever changing present.

Change and New Knowledge

The purpose of the teachers' center is to meet the needs of schools in relation to the extremely deep change which was and is occuring in England and Wales, and, for that matter, throughout the world.

The change which has come to education in England and Wales and that resulted in the establishment of centers for and by teachers, is part of a deeper change throughout society. In the past, many teachers looked to superiors for direction. Teachers were docile, as were most citizens, obedient to those in authority. Not all teachers have changed. Many still do not accept individual responsibility for their classes and for their students.

The difficulty was expressed in a summary of several teachers' center conferences.

> Many speakers stressed that too many areas and too many schools were, alas, still waiting for the answers to curriculum problems to come from on high. National development projects aroused unreasonable hopes, despite all the efforts of project directors to explain the limitations of what was being attempted. When materials and approaches failed to answer all the problems in the subject area of a particular school or group of pupils, then 'they' were criticized as being out of touch with reality.[75]

Why are teachers no longer to blindly follow direction from above? The change is more than a recognition of the unique expertness of the classroom teacher. The curriculum is changing. The purpose of school is no longer to fill the student with facts. In England and Wales this change is clearly present, not only in the development of teachers' centers, but also in the development of open education from infant schools through the Open University.

Instruction is localized and individualized. The emphasis is not on teaching, but on learning. The focal point is the individual student, and not the subject matter. Programs in instruction are used which respect the developments in educational psychology and which teach students how to learn and how to think.

Concern for the individual does not abolish the group. Neither the class nor subject matter disappear. The

individual is now recognized as being part of many groups, and his education must be adjusted to meet this individual need. For example, local meanings are applied to the lessons giving greater meaning to the individuals who are part of the local group.

As stated, many teachers continue to look for considerable direction and control from above, from the administrators and higher education faculties. Teachers, under these conditions, teach how, when, where, and what they are told to teach. The control may come from a directive, e.g., in the third week of February the second grade students are to be taught longhand writing style; or the teacher might have to prepare students to score successfully in an examination, e.g., the eleven plus examiniation.

As often as not, such a system of education emphasizes fact accumulation, group teaching, order, busy work, et cetera. Students are prepared for life. In this, class distinctions were very strong. Thus the sons of workers are prepared differently than upper class children, and minority group and poverty children are poorly prepared or ignored.

In spite of, and not because of these differences, the new approach has come to education. The reason for the change is deeper. It results from the awareness of change, that one can no longer prepare for a vocation and expect that job to last very long in its present form. Instead, students are learning how to think, and how to make choices, and how to adjust to changes in life.

The problems of today are neither clearly understood nor appreciated. But this has not meant that they have been ignored.

> In those areas where curriculum has radically changed, the changes reflect our own uncertainty about the future – creative activity replaces the imitation of accepted models, discussion replaces received morality, exploration replaces the learnings of facts, choice replaces directive. Since we do not know much about the future which lies ahead, the best we can do for our pupils is to send them out prepared to deal with them.[76]

While the problem faced by teachers' centers may not be as simply resolved as have been the proposals of Alfred North Whitehead or John Dewey, it is not because today's thinking is less clear, but that the problem is more complicated than was aniticpated.

For example, teachers working in centers recognize that students grow, not as members of a class, but as individuals. They are being educated to a place in society according to their individual differences, and not for their place in society according to the class into which they were born. This is not to deny each person's heritage and / or environment, but to recognize that each person's heritage and / or environment is unique. Although each person is always part of various groups, each person need not be absorbed by a specific group until that person's individual identity or personality is lost or destroyed.

The new education assists the student to a healthy and honest self awareness. He is not better or worse than other students, but different from them, and in this he is unique. In the traditional system of education the student was constantly kept with peers, yet competing with peers. If he wanted to write in November of the second grade he was a trouble maker and rebellious, but if he waited until April to learn this skill, which was taught in February, he was dumb. New education programs respect these individual differences, and respond to individual needs.

All of this is easier for infant and primary schools because of the work of some scholars, especially Jean Piaget. Teachers are better informed about what a child can be expected to learn and how he can best learn. Those same teachers also know that the student will learn when he is ready, and not when the teacher or school system is ready. All of this involves different teaching processes and recognition that it is normal to be different.

Freedom and Responsibility

Another change which has come today is not based upon new knowledge, but upon changing times. It is directly related to concern for the individual. In the past, men were expected to be obedient to authority, and this greatly affected the schools. Docility was the primary virtue.

Today authority remains, but it is now more responsive to individual needs. Obedience remains, but it grows from obedience to others toward obedience to self. Obviously, the student must learn to make choices, but according to his ability to choose. One would not expect a second grader to select his program of study, but certainly a college student should have reached this level of maturity.

If the individual is no longer tied to his economic or social class, if he is to be educated to make decisions for himself, to make choices, then he is being educated to be mature. He is to be free.

In over simplified fashion, authority and obedience are replaced by freedom and individual responsibility. People respond to authority according to the ability of the authority to pursuade the individual, and not through blind obedience. The teacher accepts pictures of green horses, but not the idea that real horses are green. Part of this change results because man is less certain about many of our over simplified past truths, the clearness of objective truth becomes hazy when applied to individual cases. Imagination and creativity are now encouraged, as ways to maturity.

If students learn to blindly reject authority, then they become irresponsible. Thus a learning program, although no longer structured in master-servant fashion, is structured to assist the student to grow in individual responsibility. This change has been developing for many years in America, and is seen in those classrooms where the students have accepted the responsibility to keep order. They know that school is a place for learning and they reject those who prevent or inhibit learning. This means that these students no longer respect a person because he has the title of teacher, but only if he is a teacher.

Society today is demanding that citizens be responsible, but not responsible to themselves alone, since that leads to irresponsibility. They are not to be educated to ignore authority, but to learn to make decisions after seriously examining the problem and considering the advice of experts.

In the open classroom the student is free, according to his capacity to be free. The teacher in an infant school encourages students to make choices, to express differences, but these children are very much under the advice and control of the teacher.

At that other end, the sixth form students are treated with proper respect. Very serious choices are theirs. In the Open University, the student is advised, but not controlled by the adviser. Students at that level must accept resonsibility for doing the work in their own time, in their own way, with success or failure being their own responsibility.

There is, then, a need to prepare curricular materials which encorporate developmental choice and which are individualized and localized. Content is not as important as the need to help students live with change and learn to solve problems. To put it another way, current education includes two additions to the three "r's": respect and responsibility.

Teachers' Centers

At first the English and Welsh teachers looked to the national offices for the answers, and some mistook projects, such as the new mathematics, as the needed new curriculum. The change which was coming was much greater than new materials. The national offices could not know each student or each community. Even the head could not prepare a program for the whole school, although the head could create an attitude which promoted acceptance of change.

> Happily, today the instructional task is so interpreted as to place the instructor, or teacher, in the role of providing the insentive to learn rather than the facts.
>
> The instructional task, in modern educational thinking, provides the pupil not with the facts of today that will be obsolete tomorrow but with the chance to be a flexible learner, a continual learner.[77]

Who then prepares the new materials for the second grade? A lot of material has been prepared, but it must be applied to this second grade class and to these individual students. Only the teacher of this second grade can come up with the materials to be used. This means that the second grade teacher must know each student, and must know what a typical second grader thinks and is capable of doing. So who prepares the materials? The second grade teacher.

The problem for teachers at every level is two-fold. First, new curricula must be developed, and teachers must learn how to use these materials and how to work with students under the new programs. The purpose of the teachers' center is to meet these two problems along with a third purpose more typical of England and Wales than of the United States. Teachers' centers are social centers.

It might be expected that the colleges of education and university departments of education would provide courses in which teachers could prepare for the new teaching. This has not often happened, perhaps because progress in this area is coming from within the schools, rather than being passed down to schools from higher education faculty.

The nature of the change in the schools includes greater freedom along with acceptance of responsibility by teachers and students. Few of the new breed would accept more than advice from above. Assistance is welcome, but it is the teacher's problem to solve, since no one else knows the students so well.

At the center, the teachers are in control, but they are able to involve all other groups interested in education. The higher education faculties can be requested to give presentations about any points the teachers want and need. Notice, the teachers set up the inservice program. In fact, the teachers are in control of the center, but with the cooperation of others.

Programs are now needed which lend themselves to the development of respect for self and for all others, and which teach the student to be responsible.

This gradual change has been applied in England and Wales by some of the teachers, who are developing education programs which meet these needs. These teachers are aware that they have the primary responsibility for the learning by their students. Others in authority have resonsibility to assist them, but only the teacher can directly assist the individual student. The teacher knows what is proper material to be studied for a set level of students and knows what each student needs. As students advance toward maturity they have greater input. Again, by college age the student should be the recognized primary authority regarding himself.

Central Purpose

Although the center is expected to be both a place for inservice work and for curriculum development, the reports indicate that a center becomes more involved with either one or the other. The great fear is that the distance between the good and the poor teacher will increase, because the former teacher seeks ways to improve, while the latter teacher needs assistance in adapting to changing times.

The process and balance needed for a center to function must constantly be examined; for example, the Area Resource Center

> needs to be adequately staffed to draw out of schools the skills and enthusiasms that are presently used on a narrow front, and to enable these to reach a wider public of colleagues, who would not be passive receivers but would themselves be paying back in kind into the same bank. I would have two overall aims, not be lost sight of: TO STEP UP THE PROVISION AND RAISE THE STANDARD OF RESOURCES WHICH TEACHERS NEED IF THEY ARE TO PROVIDE A RICH SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT; TO LESSEN RATHER THAN INCREASE THE BURDEN ON THE AVERAGE TEACHER. This second point is of extreme importance: new methods of teaching and learning have so far attracted a large proportion of the young, the energetic, and the very able teachers. We must at all cost avoid an educational situation in which one of the requirements of these methods is an outstanding teacher -- by definition there are not enough of these to go around.[78]

Studies of centers in England and Wales show other forms of this same problem. Perhaps they are more simple statements of the problem. Is the teachers' center in a given area to be primarily concerned with retraining teachers, or are the limited facilities to be used by these fewer faculty who are involved with curriculum development and change? In many cases, it becomes the practice for the center to be for curriculum development, not only because the facilities of the center are needed for developmental work, but also because the center's protection and support are needed by those who are violating tradition. An immediate problem for the center is to keep this smaller group from becoming a clique.[79]

This problem is usually handled by having representatives from involved groups participate in the direction of the center. This applies even to technical and science centers.[80] Another practice commonly used by centers is to have large annual meetings of all interested people, to provide general direction; and for each of these groups to be fairly represented on the central management committee.[81] The annual meeting along with fair representation on a smaller control committee prevents cliques, without destroying center purpose.

The problem of center purpose is often resolved by the group which establishes the center or by the group which gives clearer direction to a center, and it would be in response to the needs of the center participants. A group of curriculum developers who took great pains to share curriculum developers who took great pains to share their results would obviously not be a clique. A group of teachers who were interested in updating their teaching methods, et cetera, and who were open minded, would not obstruct curriculum developers, although the developers would be secondary to that center's purpose.

In writing about curriculum development centers early in the movement, one person strongly objected to the unwillingness of local teachers to accept sufficient responsibility for curriculum development. The article points out that the teachers did involve themselves in highly organized discussions and promotion of national curriculum programs.[81] But this article would seem to have been written prior to the great internal development of many centers and the large increase in numbers of centers.

If nothing else is present in centers, teacher control is present. Those centers not too involved in curriculum development quickly involve themselves in establishment of inservice programs set up for and by the teachers. To expect all teachers to be deeply involved makes about as much sense as having a tribe of all chiefs. Planners and leaders, by the very nature of planning and leadership, are outnumbered by the others. The problem of teachers accepting responsibility must be related to the action to be done and not the inaction of those who see the job being done. More clearly, many teachers have not acted because there is no need for them to accept resonsibility for program development, i.e., someone else is leading. The centers have not lacked teacher leadership, and the need for leadership in education is being met collectively.

It does not take too much imagination to understand that a center must constantly be on guard that it does not become other than a teachers' center. This could happen if it degenerated into a social center for teachers. It might become a college or university extension center or a materials center for the whole school population. Because of these problems the center is seen as a place for teachers, and not a place for students or parents. Teachers should work with both the students and the parents -- but not at the center.[83]

The center would also have to refresh itself by becoming involved with new ideas and new people. The responsibility of the warden in such matters is obvious, and his ability or lack of ability to resolve the problem is

easily seen. But in centers too small for a warden, the teachers themselves would have to be most careful not to bring about the degeneration of the center.

> In all these matters, as with the question of resources, the warning was given that centers must beware of allowing peripheral concerns to overshadow or distort their prime function.[84]

This is one difference between the English and Welsh centers and the American centers. The American "experts" are doing something for the teachers. Article after article describing center after center tells how some third group is improving the lot of the American teacher. In the American centers the teacher is there to use the materials, because the center people, or those funding and controlling the center, know better than the teachers what is best for the student. Even the large English centers recognize that the teacher knows better than the center what is best for the class and the student. There is a mutual respect present in the English situation which is lacking in the American system.

The British remain aware of this basic need for teacher control of centers. A 1973 article, which expressed fear of centralization through the Schools Council, or a teachers' college takeover of inservice programs, or the James Report professional centers, adds "Teachers' centres could cease to be centres run by and for teachers responsive to local needs."[85] Another appeal in 1974 for the continuation of small centers is by a warden who claims his center remains extremely busy and important. "And it is controlled by teachers, and this is important too, not by some external academic board, school of education, or whatever, who can only be paternalistic no matter how well-intentioned."[86]

PROFESSIONAL CENTER

The style of center, which is similar to a teachers' center, but which is defined as not being a teachers' center, is the proposed professional center in the James Report. The teachers' center is a place for teachers, not a place for students or parents, a place where probationary teachers are welcome, but the center is not responsible for supervision of the probationary teacher.[87] The James Report recommends the establishment of professional centers which would have extensive responsibility over the persons preparing to become teachers. Since this report proposes drastic changs in education for England and Wales, it should be examined for statements about teachers' centers.

The James Report is a report by a Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry, appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science. The eight members of the committee came from different areas of education and the chairman was The Lord James of Rusholme, Vice-Chancellor of the University of York. In England and Wales the vice-chancellor is the functional leader of the university, the chancellor being honorary. Of equal interest is the fact that the University of York has neither an education department nor an Area Training Organization, the current university dominated teacher training structure. In fact, the recent growth and changes in higher education, in and of itself, necessitates serious examination of every phase of higher education in England and Wales. The number of universities has doubled in the past twelve years, but these newer institutions are not involved with structures which preceded their establishment, such as Area Training Organizations.

Professional centers, as referred to in the James Report, cannot be appreciated unless seen in the light of the major recommendations of the James Report. Very briefly, the proposed education and training of teachers is divided into three stages or cycles. The first stage is general college education of the type found in American liberal arts and sciences colleges. It is non-professional education, but a major area is established during those years, e.g., history or urban problems.

The second cycle is divided into a first and second-phase. The first phase would be a year which would compare with the American professional education semester. The second phase would be compared to the American practice teaching and would also be one year.

The third phase is for practicing teachers, is the most important part of teacher education, and is not terminal. The report is not as simple as might be concluded from the above. There are proposed new degrees, regional and national organizations, replacements for the Area Training Organizations, et cetera.

The third cycle courses and programs are planned to be so extensive that learning centers would need to be established throughout England and Wales. These are to be called professional centers. They would be located at colleges of education and university departments of education and at existing center areas such as Area Resource Centers and better teachers' centers. The professional center staff would not only include persons who were part of the organization where the center was established, but also all persons in the area who had a responsibility for any phase of teacher education. The number of centers to be established would, in part, be based upon the needs of teachers. One professional center would have to be within easy reach of every school. The best place within each location would then be selected for the center, but, again, the people from the place of the center would not dominate the center.[88]

As in the case with teachers' centers, professional centers would have special purposes. Most would be general centers serving the immediate area, but one might also have a speciality such as Russian Studies and

be classified as a national or regional center for that purpose.[89]

The staff of a professional center would include both full-time persons and part-time assistance by others who were able to provide needed help such as teachers, Local Education Authority staff, college and university faculty, Her Majesty's Inspectors, et cetera. The center would be headed by a warden.[90]

The professional centers, which are located at colleges of education and, especially, university departments of education, would be expected to provide complete second and third cycle work, i.e., the full range of teacher education courses and programs. The smaller local centers would provide for third cycle work at the center, and would be permitted to provide second cycle work only after they had met regional organization standards.[91]

The similiarity between teachers' centers and professional centers is obvious when the James Committee recommends that the local professional centers be supported by the Local Education Authority, but with ". . .management committees, representative of the teachers in the schools and F.E. establishments in the locality. . ." The warden would be selected by the management committee, while other educational institutions within the area would also be represented on the management committee.[92] Clearly the smaller and more common of the professional centers would have that structure.

The independence of the professional center staff is demanded, and the ability for the staff to get away from the center for study or teaching in local schools, and the need for local teachers to be available to the center and be able to go to the center is demanded in the report.[93]

New teachers would be assigned to a professional center, along with their school assignment. These teachers would be released from teaching duties to the professional center for one-fifth time.[94] This recommendation by the James Committee is recognition of the important role teachers' centers now play in England and Wales.

The minority report, by two members of the James Committee, is not long nor does it disagree with much from the full report. In fact, it is called "Notes of Extension." They request that the professional center have the responsibility for assigning licensed teachers (practicing teachers, although that term is too limiting) to professional tutors (combined supervising and cooperating teachers, again our term does not do justice to the more involved idea of the James Committee).[95]

The cost of teacher education reform in England and Wales cannot be determined, among other reasons, because the cost for professional centers cannot be measured. It is interesting that the professional centers would be a major item in teacher education costs, yet the teacher's center was born out of economic poverty.[96] They have proven themselves and are recognized by the James Committee as a vital part of the proposed non-terminal teacher education.[97]

The James Committee recommends immediate action for its plan. Related to teachers' centers and professional centers, the report suggests that authorities look at extant teachers' centers to determine what upgrading in staff and facilities would be needed to meet professional center standards.[98] Again, the committee recognized the role of the teachers' center and firmly establishes it in the minds of educators, in opposition to those who support the traditional structures of English and Welsh education.

In reporting a meeting of wardens, the **Times Educational Supplement** points out their strong feeling that the James professional tutors be under local control, be trained as wardens are trained, and that inservice teacher training remain at local centers.[99] Even if this response was self serving, the point is well made since it would leave responsibility for necessary inservice education with those most aware of local teacher needs.

THE AMERICAN RESPONSE

It is foolish for one country to adopt in toto another country's educational changes because of differences between countries. It is equally foolish for one country either to ignore a good thing or to misapply that educational change.

In England and Wales the LEA provides money but does not set policy. The head or principal, with the assistance of staff and department chairman in larger schools, set policy. Thus school policy is controlled by professional educators, with the public able to bring pressure. Teachers, being closer to policy makers, can directly influence policy.

In America the administration enforces board policy upon the teachers. As U.S. teachers become more militant, better organized, and less docile, they will take stronger stands on educational policy. They are the group which is primarily responsible for education, they have the most expertize in this area, and they will demand respect for their expertize.

Although American teachers are trusted to eduate our children, we do not trust teachers with money for education centers. In fact most Americans, who have worked for or written about centers for U.S. teachers, think they know better than the teachers what teachers' needs are. Is the value we place on our children less than the value we place upon money, or do we like to have our children out of the house playing with teachers, whom we treat as large size children? It is nice the way dedicated Americans strive to look after, take care of,

and plan for their children, old folks, sick people, and teachers.

Perhaps the most complete and authoritarian report about American center attitudes was in the spring 1974 issue of the **Journal of Teacher Education**. In that issue the Thematic Section contains one article about English and Japanese centers, plus many articles about American center efforts and concerns. Excepting the article about foreign centers, the Thematic Section tells what can and must be done to and for teachers, rather than what teachers can do for themselves. The articles are blatantly paternaltistic, consistantly denying to teachers the respect which must be present in order for teachers to be able to accept responsibility as they have done in England and Wales.

The Schmieder / Yarger, U. S. Office of Education articles and sections completely ignore the central position of teachers in English and Welsh education.[100] The article by William L. Smith, Teacher Corp, U.S. Office of Education does not deal with teachers' centers, but discusses teaching centers, teacher centers, and leadership development centers. In no way does it consider teachers being in control.[101]

The exception to the paternalistic theme is an article which deals with Japanese and English centers. Teachers' centers in England, according to the article, have assumed major responsibility for inservice teacher education. Since teachers in England control the teachers' centers, this means that teachers control in-service programs and projects and not the administration or the higher education institutions.[102]

"The basic principle which gives the British teacher center its uniqueness and power as an educational tool is the insistence that the centers function BY and FOR teachers."[103]

The Japanese centers tend to be resource centers, but Japanese teachers also have "study circles" where teachers meet in groups to resolve or examine problems of mutual concern related to their jobs. These groups meet anywhere, but go to "education centers" for resource services. Thus the Japanese study center, and not the education center, would more clearly be the teachers' center. The education center is there to meet teacher needs as seen by someone else, but it is only used by teachers as the teachers see the need to use it.[104]

An article in **Childhood Education**, about visits to English centers, confirms the domination and control of centers by English teachers. This article adds insight into the spirit of responsibility accepted by respected teachers in England. Teachers have the opportunity and take the responsibility to fix up rooms after school, on weekends, and even during strikes.[105]

In no way does the English teacher control of centers mean that they have single responsibility. Rather it is primary responsibility for the work done in centers. An article about the Newham Teachers' Center, which discusses resources, study groups, et cetera, presents the strong feeling of cooperation, partnership, and respect for teachers which is absent in most American articles.[106]

Phi Delta Kappan presented Americans with two teachers' center articles, one in 1971 and another in 1973, which promoted teacher responsibility and respect. Unfortunately the editors published a third article in 1974 which violated the theme of the first two articles and promoted the USOE idea of doing for teachers.

The first of these three articles makes three points about the British centers: 1) fundamental educational reform comes from teachers, who have the basic responsibility in this area; 2) teachers are not likely to follow leadership from outside their own ranks, since teachers must be the leaders and not the followers; 3) teachers in England have shown that they are able and willing to accept the responsibility when faced with it. Since the teachers have the primary role as educators, they alone can bring about the necessary reform, and the teachers' centers have been established by them to meet this need.[107]

As many others are also aware, Stephen K. Bailey writes that the U.S. Office of Education promoted these ideas in 1971; but the funds which finally came from the Office of Education and the articles in the **Journal of Teacher Education**, written and / or edited by Office of Education people, ignore the central role of teachers, guaranteeing the failure of American centers as places for significant educational change.

The second **Kappan** article recognizes the need for teacher acceptance of responsibility for educational change and promotes a redistribution of power in American education. Rather than having a partnership among the groups concerned with educational change, the American universities and R&D centers set up centers for teachers which are outside the control of teachers. Since teachers are not respected and may lack self respect, the funds are not given to teachers.[108]

The third article in **Phi Delta Kappan** yields to the current Office of Education view and ignores the pitfalls expressed in the first two articles. The tone is that something should be done for teachers. It tells of presenting alternatives to teachers, giving them choices, but teachers are to choose from matters already selected by others who have examined the problem and selected possible solutions to the problem. Rather than suggesting that a school district give funds to the teachers or teacher groups for the establishment of their center, they do for the teacher, and even go so far as to suggest that an administrator be hired as a facilitator for staff development.[109] Big brother would have one more administrator hired so teachers would not have to be responsible. The fear that teachers will

make mistakes in the use of funds for centers is a fear that teachers are human. This article emphasizes communication, but the tone is unilateral communication. If we all learn to communicate, all problems will be solved, according to the article.

Two articles in **Educational Leadership** divide over the structure of centers. Wesley P. Eddy, a Canadian, in examining British centers, suggests that true teachers' centers are the way to avoid slowness of change. teachers' centers are built upon teacher needs, as seen by teachers.[110] Since it is a legitimate educational expense, national, state, and local governments should provide teachers with money for centers; which is far different than providing center services. A second article in that issue is about professional growth centers, and promotes doing things for and to teachers.[111] This is innovation to avoid change.

If the intent in establishing a center for teachers is to improve teaching, then the American centers are effective. They help many teachers prepare more interesting and productive lesson plans and classes. Centers collect and locate information and materials for teacher use. In another style of American center, the professor for a university renames and slightly changes institutes or workshops. This style center might be off campus, at a more agreeable place, and the teachers may have a greater sense of belonging, but it is the professor's program and is under university control.

Although these centers are successful, they do not accomplish what the English and Welsh teachers' centers accomplish. The American centers are for teachers, but the centers, although used by teachers, are not under teacher control. Teachers may recommend, but they do not decide, they do not control the financial aspects, they do not hire the center leader, and they do not decide what materials and equipment are to be secured or who can use the center.

American teachers are not able to, nor do they need to take responsibility either for curriculum development or curriculum change (teacher change). English and Welsh teachers have accepted this responsibility. They prepare the new programs and they set up teacher in-service courses, programs, and projects at and through their teachers' centers. American schools need programs which teach students to be responsible, to grow to maturity, to accept change, and to make decisions. The old curriculum and the old teacher training programs have not done this, and our current rash of centers for teachers cannot bring about this change.

If a free society is evolving, then American schools need the type of educational changes underway in England and Wales. If these changes are to come through the teachers, and if teachers' centers expedite the changes, then Americans should seriously consider funding teachers' centers. Trying to convert extant centers for teachers into teachers' centers is not the solution. It won't even be enough if school districts provide teachers a place in which to meet, comfortable furniture, a small kitchen, surroundings pleasing to the senses, a place to park, all of which would be available during and after school and on weekends. The physical center is not the problem.

What teachers need is respect and appreciation for the unique role they now have in education. What needs to be done, cannot be done for them. Administrators, custodians, secretaries, counsellors, et cetera, all have important roles in education, but the teaching is done by teachers, and the learning by students. All others are there to serve the teachers as they help the learners.

When teachers receive proper respect and the nature of needed change is appreciated, then the U.S. Office of Education, private foundations, school districts, and others will provide the needed funds for teachers' centers. The teacher selected center leader will be paid at the principal level. Administrators will cooperate with the center and give it full support. The center teachers will work with the university, administration, specialists, and anyone who can provide assistance. The center will belong to the teachers and not to the school district, and administrators will not control it, but their recommendations will be seriously considered.

Perhaps a way to start a teachers' center would be to have teacher leaders from a school district or level or subject area prepare a philosophy of education for the school, level, or area. Not only would this clarify the problems, but also it would establish criteria upon which to judge center activities and results, and it would be a goals and objectives. Equally important for American schools, it would be a statement of principles from the teachers about local education, and it would probably be the only statement of principles or at least it would be the most complete, balanced, and useful because of the total teacher expertese.

Having prepared a philosophy of education, the teachers could then move to accomplishing it while removing or adjusting educational practice which violated the principles agreed upon. Perhaps much of this could be done at the teachers' center, for it or something like it would need to be established by the teachers.

Teachers of America deserve respect by being responsible and demand respect because you are responsible in educating students. In this you will gain your individual and collective freedom, which can be passed on to your students as they grow to maturity. Teachers' centers in England and Wales are the result of such grass roots power change; not an either / or struggle, but a waking giant who has and will continue to

change education and educators, partly through teachers' centers.

FOOTNOTES

1. Typical of reports about American centers are three articles in **School Management**, Vol. 16, No. 7, July, 1972: Ardyce Czuchna (Mrs.), "How an REC Serves Districts in Michigan," pp. 17-18; "How a CMC Serves a District in Oregon," pp. 19-21; and, Jack Tanzman, "A New Program Approaches Educational Problem Solving," pp. 42-43. Additionally, there are a number of articles about materials resource centers in special education and audio / visual magazines.

2. Auriel Stevens, "Centres for Action, James Committee Will Give New Importance to Teachers' Centres," **Times Educational Supplement**, Dec. 17, 1971, pp. 14, 31.

3. **Teachers' Centres**, (A Survey of Centre Resources and Conditions of Service of Leaders, London: National Union of Teachers, March, 1972), pp. 1-2.

4. "List of Teachers' Centres in England and Wales," (London: Schools Council, May, 1972, Mimeographed).

5. "List of Establishments Catering for the In-service Training of Teachers, as Set Up by Local Education Authorities in the Area Training Organizations of the London Institute of Education, as of Oct., 1971," (London: University of London Institute of Education, Mimeographed).

6. Greg Jeffries, "Thoughts from the Centre," **Times Educational Supplement**, March 1, 1974, p. 3.

7. Emmeline Garnett, **Area Resource Centre: An Experiment**, (London: Edward Arnold, 1972), p. 5.

8. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **Teachers' Centres and the Changing Curriculum: A Report on Three National Conferences**, (London: Schools Council, 1970), pp. 7-11.

9. **Ibid.**

10. **Teachers' Centres**, **op. cit.**, p. 11.

11. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 7.

12. Teachers' Centres, **op. cit.**, pp. 13-14.

13. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, pp. 7-8.

14. J. G. Owen, "Developing Teachers' Centres," **Trends in Education**, No. 28 (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1972), pp. 2-7.

15. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, pp. 7-8.

16. A. Stevens, **op. cit.**

17. **Teachers' Centres**, **op. cit.**, p. 2.

18. **Ibid.**, p. 8.

19. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 16.

20. **Ibid.**, p. 8.

21. **Ibid.**, p. 25.

22. **Teachers' Centres**, **op. cit.**, p. 16.

23. **Ibid.**, pp. 13-14.

24. **Ibid.**, p. 5.

25. Aline Sandilands, "A Place to Pool Ideas," **The Teacher, Journal of the National Union of Teachers**, Vol. 17, No. 3, June 4, 1971.

26. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 22.

27. Mary Ellison, "Junior Workshop," **Trends in Education**, No. 22 (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1971), pp. 45-58.

28, Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 14.

29. L. A. Gilbert, "Our What Centre?" **Times Educational Supplement**, Feb. 28, 1969, p. 671.

30. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 14. See also Tom Hastie, "Learning About People," **Times Educational Supplement**, Feb. 15, 1974. p. 66.

31. Edward George Hollick, "A Study of the In-Service Training of Primary School Teachers with Particular Reference to Teacher Contribution and Teachers' Centres," (unpublished dissertation for Diploma of Child Development of the University of London Institute of Education, Feb., 1972), pp. 87-88.

32. Schools Council, Pamphlet 1, "First Year: An Account of the Work of a Teachers' Centre," (London Schools Council, 1969, Mimeographed), pp. 4-5.

33. **Ibid.**, p. 15.

34. A. Trauttmansdorff, "Yeovil, Nuffield

Mathematics Centre," **Times Educational Supplement**, July 21, 1967, p. 127.

35. Edward George Hollick, **op. cit.**, pp. 76-80.

36. **Ibid.**, pp. 81-84.

37. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6 **op. cit.**, p. 14.

38. **Ibid.**

39. **Ibid.**, p. 20.

40. **Ibid.**, pp. 14-15.

41. **Ibid.**, p. 12.

42. **Ibid.**, p. 13.

43. A. Stevens, **op. cit.**

44. David Johnston, **Teachers' In-Service Education**, (Oxford: Pergamon, 1971), pp. 76-87.

45. Edward George Hollick, **op. cit.**, pp. 76-80.

46. **Ibid.**, pp. 81-84.

47. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 8.

48. Michael Bingon, "Back Alley Centre Keeps Science Men on Their Toes," **Times Educational Supplement**, Sept. 1969, p. 17.

49. Schools Council, Working Paper 38, **Support for Schools Science and Technology**, (London: Evans / Methuens Educational, 1971), pp. 15-16.

50. **Ibid.**, p. 23.

51. **Ibid.**, p. 16.

52. **Ibid.**, pp. 18-20.

53. **Ibid.**, p. 23.

54. **Ibid.**, pp. 19-20.

55. **Ibid.**, p. 24.

56. **Ibid.**, pp. 26-28.

57. Norman W. Beswick, Schools Working Paper 43, **School Resource Centres**, (London: Evans / Methuens Educational, 1972), p. 10.

58. Emmeline Garnett, **Area Resource Centre: An Experiment, op. cit.**, p. 72.

59. Emmeline Garnett, "Run a Library But Write the Books," **Times Educational Supplement**, Aug. 28, 1970, p. 4.

60. T. Winsale, "Need for Schools Learning Resource Centres," **Times Educational Supplement**, Aug. 27, 1971, p. 27.

61. Emmeline Garnett, **Area Resource Centre: An Experiment, op. cit.**, pp. 85-86.

62. Norman W. Beswick, **op. cit.**, p. 17.

63. Emmeline Garnett, **Area Resource Centre: An Experiment, op. cit.**, pp. 72-73.

64. **Ibid.**, pp. 73-77.

65. **Ibid.**, pp. 77-79.

66. W. J. Hanson, "What Do We Do with that Useful Page from the Colour Supplement?," **Times Educational Supplement**, Sept. 17, 1971, p. 38.

67. Emmeline Garnett, **Area Resource Centre: An Experiment, op. cit.**, pp. 79-80.

68. **Ibid.**, pp. 81-82.

69. **Ibid.**, p. 83.

70. **Ibid.**, pp. 83-85.

71. **Ibid.**, p. 82.

72. Betty Vernon, "Good Books and Funny Dragons," **Times Educational Supplement**, Jan. 16, 1970, pp. 18, 63.

73. Colin Richards, "Teachers' Centres - A Primary School View," **Trends in Education**, No. 25 (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1972), pp. 31-33.

74. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 23.

75. **Ibid.**, p. 11.

76. Emmeline Garnett, **Area Resource Centre: An Experiment, op. cit.**, p. 1.

77. Tony Winslade, "Need for Schools Learning Resource Centres," **Times Educational Supplement**, Aug. 27, 1971, p. 27.

78. Emmeline Garnett, **op. cit.**, p. 72.

79. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 22.

80. Schools Council, Working Paper 38, **Support for School Science and Technology**, (London: Evans / Methuens Educational, 1971), p. 25.

81. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 13.

82. Colin Richards, **op. cit.**, pp. 31-33.

83. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 19.

84. **Ibid.**

85. Robert Thornbury, "Powerhouses or Postboxes," **Times Educational Supplement**, June 1, 1973, p. 2.

86. Greg Jeffries, **op. cit.**

87. Schools Council, Pamphlet 6, **op. cit.**, p. 19.

88. **Teacher Education and Training**, Report by a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1972), sects. 2.29-2.30.

89. **Ibid.**, sect. 2.32.

90. **Ibid.**, sect. 2.33.

91. **Ibid.**, sects. 2.29, 2.32-2.33.

92. **Ibid.**, sect. 2.33.

93. **Ibid.**

94. **Ibid.**, sect. 3.21.

95. **Ibid.**, p. 79.

96. Auriel Stevens, "Centres for Action, James Committee Will Give New Importance to Teachers' Centres." **Times Educational Supplement**, Dec. 17, 1971, pp. 14, 31.

97. **Teacher Education and Training, op. cit.**, sect. 6.25.

98. **Ibid.**, sect. 5.43.

99. "Keep local centres for in-service training," **Times Educational Supplement**, Oct. 20, 1972, p. 9.

100. Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, "Teacher / Teaching Centering in America," **Journal of Teacher Education**, Vol. 25, No. 1, Spr. 1974, pp. 5-12.

101. William L. Smith, "A + by Any Other Name" (guest editorial), **Journal of Teacher Education**, Vol. 25, No. 1, Spr. 1974, p. 2.

102. M. Vere DeVault, "Teacher Centres: An International Concept," **Journal of Teacher Education**, Vol. 25, No. 1, Spr. 1974, pp. 37-39.

103. **Ibid.**

104. **Ibid.**

105. E. Brooks Smith, Jr., "Total Professional Development of Teachers: The Teachers' Center Way," **Childhood Education**, Vol. 50, No. 6, Apr. / May 1974, pp. 330-32.

106. Ronald Arnold, "A Centre in Britain, " **Trends in Education**, No. 23 (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1971), pp. 42-45.

107. Stephen K. Bailey, "Teachers' Centers: A British First," **Phi Delta Kappan**, Vol. 53, Nov., 1971, pp. 146-49.

108. Paul S. Pilcher, "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" **Phi Delta Kappan**, Vol. 54, Jan., 1973, pp. 340-43.

109. William Fibkins, "The Whys and Hows of Teachers' Centers," **Phi Deltas Kappan**, Vol. 55, Apr., 1974, pp. 567-69.

110. Wesley P. Eddy, "How Successful are British Teachers' Centres?" **Educational Leadership**, Vol. 31, No. 6, Mar., 1974, pp. 509-11.

111. Helen A. Hart, "Self-Renewal: A Model," **Educational Leadership**, Vol, 31, No. 6, Mar., 1974, pp. 499-501.